REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of November 3, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 16-20, 22-25, 27-37, 39-43, 47-51, 53-56, 58-68, 70-74, 78-80, 83-86, and 88-92 are now pending, of which claims 1, 19, 32, 50, 63 and 79 are independent. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 19-20, 23-25, 27, 32, 35-37, 39, 50-51, 54-56, 58, 63, 66-68, 70, 79-80, 84-86, and 88 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, including, for example, page 12, line 29 through page 13, line 18. No new matter has been introduced.

Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Vu for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representatives on February 6th, 2007. The interview included a discussion of the currently applied § 103 rejection and the references in view of a proposed claim amendment. As reflected by the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment would overcome the references presently cited, but that it would require further searching. The current amendments to the independent claims reflect the proposed amendment discussed during the interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 16-20, 22-25, 27-37, 39-43, 47-51, 53-56, 58-68, 70-74, 78-80, 83-86, and 88-92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Allahwerdi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,928,558) in view of Audebert (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,065).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsider and withdrawal of the rejection as neither Allahwerdi, Audebert, nor any valid combination of the references describe or suggest use of the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and the user-dependent access identifiers as claimed. Specifically, with regard to claim 1, as neither Allahwerdi, Audebert, nor any valid combination of the references describe or suggest (1) receiving a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation

performed at the client on a first user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier, or (2) performing a second mathematical computation using the accessed second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system.

<u>Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 16-18</u>

Amended claim 1 recites a method for determining whether a client communication system seeking access to a host communication system is authorized to do so. In the method, a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed at the client on a user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier are received at the host from the client communication system. A second user-dependent access identifier is accessed at the host based on the receipt of the user-independent client communication-system-specific identifier. A second mathematical computation is performed using the accessed second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system. Results of the first and second mathematical computations are compared. A client communication system is designated as unauthorized based on the comparison of the results of the first and second mathematical computations. The user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier is derived from information that identifies at least a hardware component or aspect of the client communication system.

Allahwerdi is directed to identification of users in a computer system with transmission of passwords generated using a time parameter.[1] In Allahwerdi, the password is generated at a mobile device. After generation, the password and a subscriber specific identifier (or user name)

---

[1] *See* Allahwerdi at the abstract and column 7 lines 7-17

are transmitted from the mobile device to an authentication server.[2] The authentication server uses the transmitted password and subscriber specific identifier when authorizing the user.[3]

Accordingly, Allahwerdi teaches that the mobile client transmits a subscriber-specific identifier (or user name) along with a password. In contrast to Allahwerdi's transmission of a password and subscriber-specific identifier (or user name) from a mobile station to a authentication server, the claimed method specifies receipt of results of a first mathematical computation performed at the client on a first user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier. Consequently, Allahwerdi does not describe or suggest "receiving, at the host, from the client communication system, a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed at the client on a first user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier," as recited by amended claim 1.

As Allahwerdi does not describe transmission from the mobile station (or receipt at the authentication server) of the results of a first mathematical computation, Allahwerdi also does not describe or suggest "performing a second mathematical computation using the accessed second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system," as recited by amended claim 1.

The Office Action relies on Audebert as supporting "it would have been obvious to [one of] ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the different algorithm from that of the calculating means of the first [unit] and the second unit." Applicant notes that incorporating the different algorithm from that of the calculating means of the first unit and the second unit is not the claim language. Audebert does not remedy Allahweri's deficiency in describing or suggesting use of the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and the user-dependent access identifiers as claimed, nor does the Office Action contend so.

---

[2] *See* Allahwerdi at the abstract and column 6 lines 56-59
[3] *See* Allahwerdi at the abstract

Specifically, Audebert does not describe or suggest "receiving, at the host, from the client communication system, a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed at the client on a first user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier" or "performing a second mathematical computation using the accessed second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system," as recited by amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 16-18.

Independent Claims 32 and 63 and Dependent Claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78

Independent claim 32 recites a computer readable medium or propagated signal having embodied thereon a computer program for identifying an unauthorized client communication system seeking access to a host communication system in a manner corresponding to that of independent claim 1, and independent claim 63 recites an apparatus that does the same.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 32 and 63, along with claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78 that depend therefrom.

Independent Claims 19, 50, and 79 and Dependent Claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78

Each of independent claims 19, 50, and 79 recite include limitations that leverage a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed, at a client communication system, on a user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier, and the second mathematical computation using the stored version of the user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 19, 50 and 79, along with claims 20, 22-25, 27-31, 51, 53-56, 58-62, 80, 83-86, and 88-92 that depend therefrom.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim except as specifically stated in this reply.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee in the amount of $120 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/5/07

Gabriel D. Olander
Reg. No. 59,185

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40395568.doc